

A Liberal Party split gave the 1946 election to the Conservatives. Many Liberals urged Lleras to declare a state of siege, nullify the elections, and stay in office. "No," said Lleras. "Colombia is a constitutional democracy. In a democracy, the man who gets the most votes gets the job."

He went happily back to newspapering, this time by starting a lively new weekly news magazine called *Semana*.

This happy period lasted less than a year. Then Lleras was drafted as Director General of the Pan American Union. He appreciated the honor, his telegram of acceptance noted, " * * * but I will not venture to comment on the judgment of those who have chosen me."

His judgment was all right. At the Inter-American Conference in Bogotá in 1948 the Organization of American States evolved from the Pan American Union, which remained its permanent secretariat, with the OAS having all the increased powers proposed by Lleras. Perhaps the most important of these is the authority to arbitrate international clashes within the Western Hemisphere. This has been so effective that several instances of what started out to be wars were held down to border skirmishes. In each case the OAS went on to probe into the matter and to say publicly who started the trouble. Because of this one Lleras innovation, war between American nations may well have become a thing of the past.

Lleras is one of the few men I have ever met who seem to be without personal ambition. Unlike most men who have known real poverty, he appears to have no interest in money. In 1954, after 7 years of directing the OAS, he left the \$20,000-per-year, tax-free job (which also included a free house, automobile, and chauffeur) to become the unsalaried president of the then new and unendowed University of the Andes in Bogotá. His only income was the small pension drawn by every ex-President.

The university was an unlikely experiment in higher education, completely free of Government influence or support. It had too few teachers, too little money, and inadequate equipment and buildings to handle the students clamoring for admittance. Its symbol of a goat teetering precariously on an Andean peak was appropriate geographically, financially, and academically. Its only certainty was hungry but resolute independence, and this attracted Lleras.

Conscious of his academic shortcomings, the new president devoted himself to raising money. He got grants and outright gifts (one man sent \$108,000). He wheeled equipment, buildings, and even building materials. But most important for Colombia, the new post brought Lleras back to his homeland.

Meanwhile, Colombia had become submerged in an orgy of political violence. Liberals and Conservatives traditionally hated each other so single-mindedly that no Colombian third party has ever attracted more than a handful of voters. Political reprisals that began soon after the 1946 Conservative victory exploded into widespread guerrilla warfare after the 1948 assassination of Liberal Jorge Eliécer Gaitán in Bogotá. Until the end of his term in 1950, President Mariano Ospina Pérez ruled by martial law. Leonine, Liberal-hating old Laureano Gómez won a one-candidate Presidential election and intensified the persecutions. Political killings degenerated into banditry, with rape, murder, and mutilation at the fearful mortality rate of 20,000 Colombians per year.

After 3 chaotic years, Gómez was overthrown by General Gustavo Rojas Pinilla, who promptly set up shop as a worse—and more stupid—dictator. Families were dispossessed of their land, and those who were

not slaughtered fled to the cities—where there was no work for them. These quickly overwhelmed the social welfare agencies and lived, perforce, on the streets. Children became separated from their parents and lived in packs, begging and thieving. In Tolima, where statewide violence was worse, an estimated 320,000 persons, 42 percent of the state population, were forced from their land.

Agricultural production dropped sharply. Commerce went down in proportion. People quit building homes and factories. The peso, at 1.75 to the U.S. dollar in 1946 when Lleras left the government, skidded to 8.10 to the dollar under Rojas. Each year's national budget carried less for education, more for the armed forces.

This was the demoralized and outraged nation for which Alberto Lleras was trying to build a nonpolitical university. But government brutalities continued to increase. Armed police fired on demonstrating university students. Only a few months later they attacked with guns and clubs thousands of defenseless bogotanos attending a Sunday afternoon bullfight. The crowd's sin was booing the dictator's daughter.

"Afterward bodies were stacked like cordwood in the arena," a witness told me. Lleras could remain on the sidelines no longer. He attacked the dictatorship in a public speech in the capital city. On February 24, 1956, he resigned from the university.

Working with the Conservative firebrand Guillermo León Valencia, Lleras spent nearly 2 years organizing the resistance on a nationwide basis. Meanwhile, eluding police and narrowly escaping assassination, he and his colleagues worked out a unique system of government. This called for automatic 4-year alternation of the Liberals and Conservatives in the presidency. Moreover, all government jobs, from cabinet ministers to janitors, and including representatives and senators, were to be split 50-50 between the two parties.

Laureano Gómez, discredited and in exile in Spain, still retained the fanatic loyalty of many Conservatives. Lleras decided that his support was necessary to peace in Colombia. He made two trips to Spain to talk to Gómez. Finally the old warrior urged all Colombian Conservatives to unite with the Liberals to overthrow Rojas.

Now Lleras was ready. On May 6, 1957, he passed the word for a meticulously planned general strike in Bogotá. The next morning it was as if the city had died. No business opened its doors. No buses or streetcars ran. Radios were silent and no newspapers came from the presses. Bakeries offered no bread for sale and no one came to buy. Laborers stayed in their homes. Even the churches were closed.

The raging dictator sent his tanks and armored cars rumbling through the streets. The armored cars bumped to a stop, tires shredded by the thousands of carpet tacks and broken bottles with which hard-working children had sown the streets. Thirty thousand troops patrolled the city, but there was no one to jail, no one to shoot, no meetings to break up.

The strange paralysis continued for 3 days. Rojas' anger turned to fear. At 5 a.m. on May 10 telephones all over Bogotá began to ring.

"The tyrant has fled." The inaccurate message flashed through the city. Men, women, and children poured into the streets, shouting, weeping with joy, singing the national anthem. Instead of firing on the celebrants, thousands of the soldiers and police dropped their guns and joined the celebration.

At 10 a.m. Rojas did indeed flee, leaving four generals an admiral in charge of the Government. Word soon reached Lleras and Valencia, who, following the only route left

free of tacks and broken glass, drove to the palace, where they walked sedately through the ranks of armed guards to confer with the military junta.

Lleras, as always, knew just what he wanted—an end to armed oppression; a plebiscite to ask the nation's permission for his proposed change in government; elections and return to constitutional government. The junta, sick of bloodshed and chaos, agreed.

The plebiscite, held December 1, 1957, produced the biggest vote in Colombian history—4,250,000 voted "aye" for the change, only 250,000 against.

Lleras had no wish to be President, but the Conservatives could not agree on a candidate. Also, Laureano Gómez, back from Spain, insisted that his ex-enemy was the only man for the job. Reluctantly Lleras agreed to run. Elections were scheduled, but the danger was not over. Some of the disgruntled military officers had secretly planned a counterrevolution to return Rojas to power.

At 4 a.m., 2 days before the election, Lleras was awakened quietly by his night watchman. "Military police are everywhere," whispered the terrified man. Reconnoitering from the windows, Lleras saw more than 50 military police surrounding the block. The telephone rang.

"There's been a revolution," said an urgent voice. "They've captured all the junta except Admiral Piedrahita. They're coming to get you."

"I believe you," Lleras replied. Calmly he bathed, shaved, and dressed with his usual meticulous care. As he adjusted his necktie the front door shook under a heavy knock. Lleras opened the door.

"Good morning, gentlemen," he said formally to the two armed lieutenants blocking the entrance. "Shall we go?"

He was taken under guard to join the four captive members of the junta. Word of the coup flashed through Bogotá. Loyal army units had gone on the alert. As the jeep sped past the presidential palace a loyal army officer stopped it.

"Which one do you have there?"

"Lleras," replied the driver. "We're taking him to the prison."

The army man pretended to be a conspirator. "No, no," he said, "Lleras is to be brought here."

The confused military police saw their prisoner escorted into the palace. Lleras headed for the radio and told the nation what was going on. Admiral Piedrahita eluded his would-be captors and joined him. For hours they took turns at the microphone. Under the intense public scrutiny resulting from the Lleras-Piedrahita barrage the revolution evaporated. No blood was shed, and captive junta members were freed, and Lleras won the election by a landslide.

After his inauguration in August 1958, one of his first acts was to lift the almost continuous 10-year state of siege. He kept emergency controls only in the five states where violence was concentrated. Even there he abolished press censorship, restored civilian government and most civil liberties.

The Cabinet meetings of those first months lasted from 12 to 16 hours. "It was a rare meeting that broke up before dawn," one of his Ministers told me.

"He never cut a discussion short," said another. This thorough talking-out produced a large percentage of unanimous decisions.

The President listened calmly through the lengthy sessions. When Liberal and Conservative tempers rose he restored peace, usually with a gentle witticism. Slumped like a teenager in the huge presidential chair, listening, considering, improvising, Lleras had one rule against which all suggestions were measured: "We have to do what

we can with what we have." His mere presence in the government sent the anemic peso up 70 points during the first 25 days of his regime.

The supposed irreducible minimum of \$40 million per month of imports was slashed to \$25 million by forbidding the import of luxury and nonessential items. Desperate Colombians began manufacturing their own nylons, kitchen utensils, typewriter ribbons, wool textiles, glassware, cosmetics, and the like.

Gradually, some of the estimated \$350 million that prudent Colombians and resident foreigners had cached in U.S. and Swiss banks began trickling back—people wanted to get in on the ground floor of what was to be the country's biggest building boom.

Rojas had left many half-finished public works. Now these contracts were dissected and scaled down to what the country could afford. Then Lleras ordered the pace of construction stepped up, so that investments might begin paying off. He established a department of rehabilitation and drafted José Gómez Pinzón, a millionaire construction contractor, to run it. Gómez Pinzón and Lleras worked out a widespread program of building simple roads, bridges, small airports, and telegraph stations in the wilder areas. These projects offered employment to anyone who would work.

As roads penetrated the wilderness, modest rural schools and vocational training centers were built. Polivalente (multifunctional) teams of doctors, nurses, engineers, agronomists and social workers went into devastated areas to begin the long job of rehabilitation. At first regarded with suspicion, they refused to talk politics, crime, or punishment, and gradually won the confidence of the wary hill people.

Homeless thousands in the cities were returned to lands from which they had fled. Men came back to work the coffee plantations, the fields of rice and cane. With agonizing slowness the curve of production turned upward. For refugees in the cities who had no land to go back to, low-cost housing projects were started. By the end of 1959 more than a hundred million pesos had been invested in rehabilitation. More than 8,000 families had been returned to an orderly life, and the simple mountain roads had opened new areas for many thousands more. This year a colonization program will begin for those who, for whatever reason, cannot return to their native regions. Congress renewed the rehabilitation act for 2 more years.

Colombia today is well started on the road back. Thanks to hard work and austerity, gold reserves have risen from \$85 million to more than \$210 million. The \$498 million commercial debt is down to \$60 million, and payments are made on time.

The last year Rojas was in office his Education Ministry received only 72 million pesos. For 1960 the congress has earmarked 195 million for education.

Some violence persists, as a hangover from 10 years of indiscriminate slaughter. Most of this is committed by youngsters in their late teens and early twenties. Lleras considers these two or three thousand young savages Colombia's worst problem. "They grow up knowing nothing but robbery and murder," he points out. "As the rehabilitation program spreads we shall be able to salvage some of them."

Lleras considers Communist agitation a potential danger. "They concentrate their efforts among the university students and the labor unions," he said. "Time will prove that they do not deliver what they promise, and improving conditions will give them less to talk about. But meantime they try to convert any incident into a national disaster."

All-night Cabinet sessions are no more. Lleras now sees his ministers and other dignitaries during the day. About 5 p.m. he gets down to writing his message to congress and his lucid public speeches.

"I worked on morning newspapers too long to get much done in the daytime," he quipped. Often the rattle of his typewriter echoes in the palace until 3 a.m.

Lleras' appearance in public is greeted by applause and the spontaneous waving of handkerchiefs. The reverent people press close and he makes no effort to keep them at a distance. He will not have a bodyguard, and drives his own car except on state occasions.

A few months ago Lleras showed up suddenly on the campus of the University of the Andes. A gardener, recognizing his former boss, greeted him cordially.

"How are you doing in your new business?" he inquired.

"Frankly, Jorge, I'm not doing too well at it," replied Lleras. "Sometimes I think I should have stayed here."

He could get an argument on that point. Recently a conservative leader was asked privately to suggest the best man his party could name to follow Lleras. After some thought, he replied, ruefully:

"Alberto Lleras."

David Lawrence, Widely Respected Columnist, Speaks His Mind on Retired Officers and Conflicts of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, the nationally known and highly respected syndicated columnist, has written a very knowledgeable and penetrating piece on the current discussion of retired officers and their relationship to the Defense Department after they leave the Pentagon.

His article approaches the subject from a very analytical and objective position.

As with everything he writes, David Lawrence has again made a fine contribution to the problem which the House will have to decide when pending legislation comes up for disposition on Wednesday.

Here is Mr. Lawrence's article, to which I fully subscribe:

DEFENSE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST—BILL TO CURB PENTAGON SALES CONTRACTS BY RETIRED OFFICERS UP FOR HOUSE VOTE

(By David Lawrence)

In these days of payola and accusations of conflict of interest with respect to members of Federal commissions or agencies, it seems strange that a big question mark isn't getting much attention generally.

This is in the Department of Defense, and it concerns some of the many generals and admirals who have retired from the armed services but who draw big salaries from defense contractors and nevertheless maintain their own sales contacts at the Pentagon.

A House committee has held hearings and uncovered an unhealthy and questionable relationship between former military officers

and the bureaus in the Pentagon that award contracts. The House of Representatives will vote Wednesday on a measure that would prohibit any officer for 2 years after his retirement from making any sales contacts with the Pentagon.

House Members generally are agreed that the practice should be discouraged, but some of them want merely to limit the penalty to a loss of the retired pay. Other Members say that it would mean nothing for a retired officer to give up 2 years of a pension at \$10,000 a year when he is being paid a salary of \$50,000 or more by a defense contractor during each of those same 2 years.

Instead, Representative HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, who has been leading the fight against the so-called munitions lobby, is sponsoring an amendment to the pending bill so that it would be a violation of law, subject to criminal penalties, if a retired officer during the 2 years following his retirement engaged in any form of selling at the Pentagon.

This is in line with other existing law which forbids any attorney employed in the Internal Revenue Service from practicing before the Treasury Department for 2 years after he has left the Government. There is a similar statute which forbids attorneys from pressing monetary claims for clients before the Government within 2 years after being employed in the Department of Justice.

Many of the military officers, while on active duty, have a voice in recommending the appointment of their own successors in charge of important defense projects. Naturally, it is inferred that there might be an obligation of some kind felt by the incumbent if his predecessor appeared before him later as a sales representative of a defense contractor.

Conflicts of interest are difficult to legislate upon, and there is no way to instill honesty where it is absent, but the Government can take some steps to discourage conflicts of interest. One method embodied in the pending bill in the House calls for publicity of the names of all former officers who are employed by defense contractors. Such an enrollment would be posted and distributed inside the bureaus at the Pentagon and kept up to date.

There have been provisions from time to time in appropriation laws, ever since 1896, aimed at those who retire from the armed services and take jobs with defense contractors, but these statutes do not remain in permanent form in the law. The present effort is to enact a broad statute that will stay in effect continuously and bar retired officers from becoming salesmen at the Pentagon for at least 2 years after their retirement.

The House committee, which recently carried on an investigation of the whole subject for more than 2 months, found that there are 2,000 former officers now employed by defense contractors, and that of this number 260 are engaged in some form of selling at the Pentagon.

There is no objection, of course, to the employment of former officers by defense contractors. The knowledge these servicemen have is valuable and can be of great help in developing the proper weapons and improving the Nation's armament. But there is a difference between duties that are confined to consultations held inside the defense contractor's own offices where advice is given to associates, and a direct contact by such a retired officer on visits to the Pentagon.

There are other evils which have not yet been remedied but are under study by House Members. These concern the activities of civilians who resign from active posts in the Department of Defense and immediately be-

come highly placed executives in companies that are engaged in many billions of dollars of defense work. No bills have as yet been pressed on this issue, but steps to deal with it are in the making.

There are upward of \$50 billion of defense contracts each year, and the existence of a "munitions lobby" has been mentioned by President Eisenhower himself at one of his press conferences. Much of the missile gap propaganda is believed to have had its origin among officers of defense contractor companies.

It would be a tragic thing if Nikita Khrushchev were able to get any support for his constant cry that disarmament is being blocked in America and armament is being increased largely as a result of a "munitions lobby." It is essential for the sound development of an effective defense program that America be rid of any practice that could cast doubt on the integrity of the Department of Defense and thus weaken the confidence of the American people in the judgment of the men who disburse the public funds for the armed services.

Storing Insanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, there is an increasing concern among those of us representing predominantly urban districts that the farm programs are claiming far too big a share of the city dweller's pocketbook.

But one of the most depressing aspects of the whole cumbersome, outmoded but burdensome business of farm subsidies is that even the long-time advocates of price fixing and production control programs admit the farmer is not benefiting very much.

This is pointed up by an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal. The editorial, very appropriately entitled "Storing Insanity," points up the breakdown of storage costs per day for the various commodities supported by the Federal Government. Farmers get little if anything of these dollars.

I am more than ever convinced that worn-out political answers to the economic problems facing agriculture must be replaced by a sound program that increasingly gets the Government out of the farm business and gets it off the backs of farmers and consumers alike.

I include the editorial as a part of my remarks in the RECORD:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

STORING INSANITY

Would you care to know how much it costs the taxpayers every day for storage of commodities Uncle Sam has on hand because of the farm program's high price supports?

Let's ease into this with two low ones; honey and tobacco. Uncle Sam pays out only \$131 a day for honey and only \$238 a day for tobacco, which, if it indicates anything at all, suggests that people smoke nearly all the tobacco that's grown here and that the bees aren't nearly as busy as the peanut farmers.

The peanut storage costs come to \$6,000 a day; flaxseed and rye costs come to \$7,000 each a day. Oats cost the taxpayer \$15,000 a day for storage; rice, \$17,000 a day; soybeans, \$23,000; milk and butter fat, \$29,000; barley, \$64,000 a day and cotton \$76,000 a day.

But even these are peanuts compared to the big boys. Have a good look:

Grain sorghums cost \$262,000 a day for storage.

Corn costs \$444,000 a day for storage.

And wheat costs \$579,000 a day for storage.

That's every day. None of these costs include what was paid by the taxpayers, through their agent, Uncle Sam, for the stuff. It's just storage costs.

Total cost of storage for all these commodities comes to \$1,547,000 a day or better than \$550 million a year—and that, in anybody's book, is a lot to pay for storing up our harvests of insanity.

Can United States Buy Respect?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 4, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, another of the Nation's leading businessmen, Mr. Sterling Morton, chairman of the board, Morton Salt Co., warns that many of our foreign policies are leading us into trouble.

The following are Mr. Morton's views on this subject as presented to the directors of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association:

A QUICK LOOK AROUND

(By Sterling Morton)

This short talk will cover merely the highlights of certain important matters as they appear to an ordinary citizen—but one who has been around a long time and who has done much traveling abroad. So, hold your hats for a roller-skate trip to a few European countries—then we'll settle down for some comments on home affairs.

WEST GERMANY MAKING REAL PROGRESS

We shall look first at Germany, that miracle of recovery from a terrific punishment. But, like genius, this miracle is based mainly on hard work. The Germans have always been hard workers. Immediately after the war they seemed almost frenzied in their efforts to regain their premier position in Europe. In my opinion, they have attained it, financially and industrially, but that excellent habit of hard work persists. German factories, modern, efficient, well managed, are capable of competing with the very best we have. Their export figures are eloquent. Perhaps they now realize that their challenge to the world must be on the battlefields of peaceful trade, not those of war. They are determined as well as an industrious people, so we should be well content to have some German divisions and some Luftwaffe planes taking their places in the defense pattern for Europe. Germans are intelligent and resourceful fighters. The West Germans know communism all too well; are divided by it from their eastern provinces, so are, undoubtedly, less tainted than any major Western nation, including our own. Probably less than 5 percent are possible Communists. I'm glad the Germans are now on our side.

FRANCE AT CRITICAL STAGE

France: Now under the benevolent dictatorship of a great, if difficult, man—a Frenchman to the core, a statesman who has abated the hatred, hundreds of years old, between France and Germany. Perhaps his dreams of "glory" are unrealistic, but they appeal to the French temperament and give the people a rallying point. France is a great country, a rich country, the most nearly self-sufficient in all Europe—and growing more so. For over 20 years it has suffered under Governments which had no respect, no leadership, no confidence. Now, De Gaulle gives the French all three. He is the most realistic of all Western heads of state in dealing with the Moscow gangsters. Granted a solution to the Algerian question, the country should continue prosperous—if it can stop that cancer of "social benefits" which is also draining its lifeblood and, parenthetically, erodes the economies of most Western nations. The Communists, an official political party, have, roughly, a third of the votes. I should estimate that at least another quarter or third of the population is so infiltrated with extreme socialism that it could easily cross the faint line between these two "isms" to cooperate with a Communist takeover. France is at a critical stage. We should, most fervently, hope for the "big fellows'" continued good health.

Let us deal with France on the basis of mutual benefits and mutual obligations, forgetting sentimentalism. Lafayette has, long since, been paid off—with compound interest.

ITALY AND COMMUNISM

Italy is hard to appraise, as conditions differ so from north to south with Sicily as a third factor. There is prosperity in the north and things are better than they were in Sicily and the south. Italy is full of Communists, but, perhaps, not too many are of the Moscow type. True, those of the north are "factory proletarians." But, southern Communists are, I feel, mostly poor devils trying desperately to wrest a living from a semi-barren country. They would welcome any change, feeling it could hardly be for the worse. The Italian "right wing" parties hold power only through uneasy coalitions. But, so far, so good. At an estimate, perhaps over 60 percent of the Italians could be expected to go along with a Communist regime; that is, until they find out what it really means—then, it's too late to change.

BRITAIN HAS FIRM POLICIES

And now to the United Kingdom, considered our firmest ally. I wonder. We speak the same language (within limits), we share a common heritage of freedom, literature, and law, but we look at many things quite differently. They are a small island, dependent on trade for the very food they eat, we have vast food surpluses. They are old as nations go, we are approaching middle age. Their population is extremely homogeneous, ours perhaps the most heterogeneous in history. No British political party has to "balance" its local tickets with names denoting various racial stocks. There are no "hyphenated Englishmen." The royal house provides a banner around which they rally, we lack such a "standard." As peoples, we are quite different one from the other as well as quite similar. All in all, I feel we should make a mistake to count on their complete support in every emergency. Korea was a case in point for us—Suez a great shock to them.

It is axiomatic that Britain has no permanent allies and no permanent enemies. Britain has firm policies and tailors its alliances and its wars to further these policies. Right now, there are strong efforts to carry to success one old and steadfast policy—to again be the "third force" in Europe. A cynic once said, "The strongest continental power is always Britain's enemy, the second strongest is always Britain's friend."

So, it is not surprising to see Britain flirting with the Soviets, not only for the fancied, glittering opportunities for trade, not only as a check on us, but to insure her own survival should war between the two giants come. Remember, our bombers cannot take off from our bases there unless cleared by the Prime Minister.

Churchill has lived to see most of that "liquidation of the Empire" he decried so eloquently. Kipling was a true prophet when he wrote:

"Lo! All our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!"

But, the British are smart, able, and experienced, so we can learn much from them—about a Socialist government, for instance. And about shipping and banking, about diplomacy, intelligence, and education, and, above all, about high standards of public service. While we hope they will always be on our side, we should never be too sure. They will be with us when it is to their advantage—period.

And this observation on self-interest applies to all countries. It would be, indeed, most dangerous to assume that any other nation would come to our defense. NATO is today giving way to nationalism. We must be prepared to defend ourselves and, if necessary, by ourselves. It is sheer folly to expect to bribe alien governments to help us or to hire alien soldiers to defend us. Have we forgotten those Hessians?

CAN UNITED STATES BUY RESPECT AND FRIENDSHIP?

Now, for a look at our own country. The world, in general, seems to hold us in less and less respect. This is distressing but quite true. And perhaps with just cause. Respect comes to those who deserve it. Have we deserved it? Our airplanes are shot down, our soldiers are imprisoned, our citizens are killed and their property confiscated, while our Vice President is insulted and spat upon. Yet, we confine ourselves to mild "diplomatic representations." A bearded Communist murders and pillages a hundred miles from our coast. We gave him support which we denied to his predecessor, who, whatever his faults, was on our side. How can such actions create respect for a nation? Some of us still remember Teddy Roosevelt and hang our heads in shame when we contrast his militant protection of our rights with the shilly-shallying doubletalk of today. Panama threatens the canal, our lifeline, even after successive generations of Panamanian politicians have extorted millions from us.

We should say, in unmistakable language (and with a few marines), that the canal is ours, that we intend to keep it and that any who challenge our rights there are likely to get hurt. From time immemorial, men have been willing to go into battle for their country's good, yet our President says that literally nothing (except direct, armed attack) now would take us to war, big or small. No wonder that other nations take us at our word and feel safe in harassing us—that dime-a-dozen despots dictate to us. We try to buy respect and friendship. But we get neither—nor will we unless and until we take firm stands—yes, even risk war or wage war. Greece, Turkey, Quemoy—all proved that a firm stand brings results. War may be "unthinkable," but a United States of America on its knees is "inconceivable."

SOVIET PROPAGANDA AND PROGRESS

The visit of the head gangster gave him an outstanding propaganda triumph which, undoubtedly, strengthened him at home and brought dismay to freedom-fighters everywhere. But, he's a smart fellow, and it stands to reason that he learned a lot. The cool treatment at the start, climaxed by the wonderful going-over he got from the mayor of Los Angeles, made him show his true

colors to millions of our people. The warming up afterward could not erase that picture of a cruel, intolerant despot. I am sure his sharp, little pig-eyes saw much to give him sober thought. The trip won't make him a good Indian, but it should make him a more cautious one.

On the other hand, let's not fool ourselves over the extent to which communism and socialism have penetrated this country. Am I wrong in my estimate that a quarter of our people would welcome one or the other? There must have been large numbers of spectators who wished to cheer Khrushchey—but felt it healthier not to. Even though the voices of most who actively fought communism here have been muffled, if not stifled, by official action, the reaction of the (literal) "man in the street" might have been very violent.

It is hard to understand the reports on Russia we get from our own returning travelers, except on the premise that they are usually uninformed as to the state and rate of industrial development at home. When they praise the great progress of recent years, many do not realize that in czarist days Russia had excellent engineers and technical people as well as many skilled workers and artisans. There were many, many Russians who were neither exploiting nobles nor ox-like peasants. The Bolsheviks killed off most of these, so they had to grow an entirely new crop of good brains. Now, that crop is ripening and, I surmise, giving the bosses in the Kremlin plenty to worry about.

UNITED STATES VERSUS SOVIET EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

We have heard much recently about Russian education. Many say it gets better results than our system. If so, the reason lies in three words—hard study—discipline. Our educators experiment, desperately seeking some system which will educate our youth by a sort of osmosis, letting them soak up learning without study or application. Life adjustment looms larger than arithmetic, social graces are more to be desired than ability to read readily, and athletic prowess seems worth more than ability to construct a simple sentence. Our professors come back starry-eyed from junkets (usually at the taxpayer's expense) to the Soviet Union and bubble over with enthusiastic envy at the high status of educators there. But, how many of them would accept the iron discipline, the absolute conformity, the complete lack of academic freedom which is the other side of the coin? Would they enforce those long hours on students, would they flunk a student knowing it meant immediate transfer to the labor or Armed Forces and an inferior status for life, would they spy on and denounce their colleagues, sending them, possibly, to the execution cellars? Let's get a little commonsense into these discussions of education in Russia. Our educators can't have their cake and eat it too.

UNITED STATES CAN WIDEN GAP—IF

No well-informed person can believe that the Russians will soon catch up with us economically. In many departments, they will have to increase their pace even to keep the present gap from widening. We can leave them farther and farther behind if we have the will, determination and strength of character. To continue to progress, we must change our taxation so it does not stifle initiative, must bring the labor barons under control before they destroy the real gains labor has made. We must recreate the spirit of loyalty and careful workmanship at all levels—blue collar—white collar. Above all, we must quite soberly decide whether expense-account-pid conferences at fine resorts (in reality golf outings), cocktail parties, customer or entertainment, and, above all, complacency-breeding pension plans are slowing down our business leadership. The

ship of business has picked up a lot of barnacles, too. We can keep well ahead, but only by real work, not talk. We must have decent, honest, economical government at all levels. Now, the waste is appalling. Above all, we must rekindle our traditional dedication to equal opportunity, to free, competitive enterprise and to a patriotism which is as critical of our country's faults as it is proud of its greatness.

Yet, there are those in our country who are so muddle minded that they see only our faults, only our weaknesses. They skim over the real facts of our national life—the world's highest standard of living, the world's most tolerant and liberal legislatures and courts, they forget that emigration to the United States is still the heart's desire of millions. How many wish to move to a Communist state?

IS LESS GOVERNMENT AND MORE FREEDOM OUR ANSWER?

What, of late, has brought about the deplorable letdown in our national spirit—yes, even in that primary urge for self-preservation which is the first law of nations as well as of individuals?

What has come over this great country that we should be so terrified by our enemy? Should the odds be against us, which any reasonable person must doubt, they are small, indeed, compared to the odds against the Colonies in 1775 or the infant Republic in 1812. Have we gone soft that we should constantly retreat before a foreign enemy, that we should accept shameful compromises such as that in Korea, that we should appease a bloodstained murderer and treat him as an honored guest—even while he refuses to deliver up or account for our missing flyers?

Why are we so frantically seeking high-level meetings with the Soviet? Agreements resulting from such meetings in the past have been broken contemptuously by the Soviets in practically every instance. Why even talk with such untrustworthy scum? Do our representatives feel we are inferior to our enemy? We most decidedly are not.

Yet, our enemy does lack our hesitations, our confusions, our temporizings, our willingness to concede. We seem to have lost the drive which inspired our forefathers and built our Nation. Are we drifting, prematurely and leaderless, into that lethargy of age which foretells the doom of a Nation? Has not our Government already too much power—the kind of power which Jefferson feared, the power which throttles a country, the power to "lay taxes which eat out our substance." If so, should not all of us strive for less government and more freedom—except for Communists.

Health Insurance for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, health insurance is especially important in meeting the high cost of medical care for older persons living on restricted and limited incomes. The future possibilities are discussed by James R. Williams, vice president of the Health Insurance Institute.

This is the fifth in a series of columns written for Ray Henry which appeared